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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript entitled "Self-evaluated anxiety in the Norwegian population: Prevalence and associated factors" examines self-evaluated anxiety using a cross-sectional study.

Abstract:
- Can you clarify what 34% valid means?
- Should re-phrase "risk" to "odds" since odds ratios are being presented.

Introduction:
- First paragraph: I think a sentence or two connecting mental health to education and unemployment is needed
- Page 3, Line 29: How accurate are self-reported evaluations? How do they compare with a clinical diagnosis?
- Page 4, line 5: What is the prevalence of psychological symptoms among the elderly?

Methods:
- Page 5, lines 21-37: consider moving to the results section
- Page 8, line 12: It is indicated that "Initial descriptive analyses employed frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations as appropriate." Can the authors elaborate what analyses were specifically done and to what degree?
- Page 8: Since there were 3 answers for anxiety I would consider conducting a polytomous logistic regression model, so that those answering the question could be included fully into the analysis.

Results:
- Page 9, did you do a chi-square to test the difference in proportions among men and women?
- I would list the scores and chi-square pvalues for scores on general self-efficacy, extraversion, and neuroticism, rather than just speaking in general terms.
- Make sure to report results as "odds" rather than "risk"
- Sensitivity analysis: I would also examine a dichotomous variable "every anxiety (yes to either question pertaining to current anxiety or past anxiety) versus none". I also think it might be more interesting to also stratify by certain age categories.
Discussion:
- I think the use of a cross-sectional survey could be considered to be a large limitation of this work and should be mentioned.
- While the sample size is reasonably sized, the fact that it is considered to be representative is a more important take-home point.

Table 1:
Only current and lifetime anxiety are listed. How many had no anxiety and how many indicated only anxiety in the past?

Table 2:
Is the n (1684) accurate? Didn't you not include those who didn't have current anxiety?

Table 3:
Is this n correct? - people were excluded in this model - were they just coded as having no anxiety or were they removed from the analysis?
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